



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,095	07/15/2003	Andy Harjanto	13768.604.22	8726
7590 07/21/2008				
RICK D. NYDEGGER WORKMAN NYDEGGER 1000 Eagle Gate Tower 60 East South Temple Salt Lake City, UT 84111			EXAMINER STACE, BRENT S	
			ART UNIT 2161	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/21/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/620,095

**Applicant(s)**

HARJANTO, ANDY

**Examiner**

BRENT STACE

**Art Unit**

2161

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 7-9, 12, 14-16, 18-21, 29-34 and 36-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 7-9, 12, 14-16, 18-21, 29-34 and 36-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Final Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/25/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Remarks***

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008. Claims 2-4, 7-9, 12, 14-16, 18-21, 29-34, and 36-39 are pending. In the amendment filed May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008, no claims are amended, and Claims 31, 37, 38, and 39 are independent Claims. The examiner acknowledges that no new matter was introduced and the claims are supported by the specification.

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/12/08 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008 with respect to Claims 2-4, 7-9, 12, 14-16, 18-21, and 29-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. The cited Cameron prior art is prior art that qualifies under 102(a) and 102(e). With regards to Applicant's 1.131 Affidavits filed 12/26/07 and 5/12/08 and Applicant's arguments dated 5/12/08, the 102(e)-based rejection was withdrawn in view of 35 U.S.C 103(c)(1). However, the Affidavit filed 12/26/07 with Exhibit A, the Affidavit filed 5/12/08 both and the remarks filed 5/12/08 do not adequately show a correspondence or mapping with the Exhibit to the claims. Without this, there is no substantial proof that one of ordinary skill in the art would have conceived of or reduced to practice the claimed invention by just reviewing Exhibit A. As such, the 103 rejections are maintained below since the Cameron reference still qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(a). See below for additional information regarding the 1.131 Affidavits.
5. The Applicant's remarks attempt to make a correspondence between the Exhibit and the claims, but the remarks only cite small broad discussions (no page numbers or areas of these discussions were provided) in the Exhibit that allegedly show sufficient evidence for many limitations. It is unclear to the examiner how these small broad discussions in the Exhibit teach the corresponding claimed limitations. Additionally, the examiner does not find any teaching in Exhibit A of the claimed "database" (Claim 31, line 2, 3, etc) or the claimed "converting the abbreviated XPath expression to one or more database queries" (Claim 31, lines 22-23). Exhibit A may not teach other limitations of the independent claims; however, it is difficult to determine this given the citings of small broad discussions in the Exhibit as allegedly teaching a large number of claimed limitations.

6. The other claims argued merely because of a dependency on a previously argued claim(s) in the arguments presented to the examiner, filed May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2008, are moot in view of the examiner's interpretation of the claims and art and are still considered rejected based on their respective rejections from at least a prior Office action (part(s) of recited below).

***Response to Amendment***

**1.131 Affidavits**

7. The Affidavits filed 12/26/07 and 5/12/08 under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 have been considered but are ineffective to overcome the Cameron reference (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0004964).

8. The declarations allege that the claimed invention was reduced to practice on or before 2 January 2003, a conclusion that has yet to be drawn based upon the submitted evidence.

The evidence submitted in support of the Applicant's declarations include an email communication between the instant application's inventor (Andy Harganto) and Kim Cameron (possibly the same inventor in the Cameron reference) dated 22 May 2002. One fact that could be alleged based upon this document is that (for instance) abbreviated XPath can be used to obtain information prior to 2 January 2003. This fact would be fully supported by the document, since the document summarizes different XPath queries to obtain different information.

This evidence, however, by itself, fails to support the conclusion alleged in the Applicant's declarations that the claimed invention was conceived of and reduced to practice prior to 2 January 2003. As such, the Applicants have failed to meet their burden under 37 C.F.R. 1.131(b).

The examiner would like to point out a possible typographical error in the 1.131 Affidavit filed 5/12/08. #1 in the Affidavit refers to an email dated 5/2/02. Other declarations surmise that this email was the previously submitted Exhibit A email. Exhibit A's date is 5/22/02, not 5/2/02. This appears to be a typographical error.

#### Conception

9. The affidavit's and evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Cameron reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The Affidavit of 5/12/08 declares that a prototype of the invention was created. However, there is no evidence of this. As such, there is no demonstrative evidence to show complete conception of the invention at the date of the email communication stated.

#### Reduction To Practice

10. In this case, an actual reduction to practice is alleged to have occurred prior to 2 January 2003. However, actual reduction to practice is not fully supported by the email document submitted or the allegations of facts in the Affidavits.

11. For the reasons cited above, the declarations filed by the Applicants under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 fail to establish that the claimed invention was conceived of or reduced to practice prior to the critical period. As such, the Affidavits are insufficient to establish invention prior to the prior art reference relied upon in the rejections of record. The rejections are maintained by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 2-4, 7-9, 12, 14-16, 18-21, 29-31, 33, 34, and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0004964 (Cameron et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078094 (Krishnaprasad et al.).

For **Claim 31**, Cameron teaches: "A method for accessing objects arranged in a hierarchy in a database, [Cameron, paragraph [0034]] comprising:

- storing objects in a database, where in the objects each comprise corresponding attributes; [Cameron, paragraphs [0034] and [0035]]
- defining relationships linking different attributes of different objects in a relationship not identified by the hierarchy of the database, the relationship not

being explicitly identified in the database, and not ascertainable by checking attribute names in the database, [Cameron, paragraphs [0034] and [0035]] wherein defining the relationships includes creating pointers linking each object by a defined attribute relationship with another object, and such that the defined attribute relationships comprise linked paths between the objects, as defined by their attributes, [Cameron, paragraphs [0034] and [0035]] and wherein the defined relationships comprise relationships other than parent-child relationships defined by a directory hierarchy, [Cameron, Table 1] and wherein defining attribute relationships for linking objects enables objects of different types to be linked by the defined attribute relationships, [Cameron, paragraph [0043] and Tables 1 and 4] each attribute relationship comprising a defined name [Cameron, paragraphs [0035] and [0108]];

- receiving a client request for accessing a requested object in the database, wherein the request is entered in the format of a location path expression [Cameron, Figs. 6-12 with paragraph [0094]] having the following format:
  - a first expression component reciting a view name, wherein the view name is a particular defined name of a particular one of the defined attribute relationships; [Cameron, paragraphs [0035] and [0108]] and
  - at least one path element defining one of the objects related by the defined attribute relationship associated with the view name and that defines at least a portion of a linked path to the requested object; [Cameron, paragraph [0108] with Cameron, Figs. 9-12]



- processing the client request comprising the location path expression ... to locate the requested object in the database; [Cameron, paragraph [0094]] and
- returning the requested object and any other data specified in the location path expression to a client" [Cameron, paragraphs [0106] with [0122]].

Cameron discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:

- "...as an abbreviated XPath expression
- ...by converting the abbreviated XPath expression to one or more database queries."

With respect to Claim 31, an analogous art, Krishnaprasad, teaches:

- "...as an abbreviated XPath expression [Krishnaprasad, paragraph [0052]]
- ...by converting the abbreviated XPath expression to one or more database queries" [Krishnaprasad, paragraph [0051]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Krishnaprasad and Cameron before him/her to combine Krishnaprasad with Cameron because both inventions are directed towards using databases to retrieve data.

Krishnaprasad's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Cameron's invention because both inventions use databases. Cameron discloses dynamically generating multiple hierarchies of inter-object relationships based on object attribute values (title) comprising querying at least a database and retrieving results. However, Cameron does not expressly disclose querying using an abbreviated XPath expression that gets converted into one or more database queries. Krishnaprasad

discloses a method and apparatus for XML visualization of a relational database and universal resource identifiers to database data and metadata (title) comprising translating an exemplified abbreviated XPath query into relational database queries.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention having the teachings of Krishnaprasad and Cameron before him/her to take the translating XPath to relational database queries from Krishnaprasad and install it into the invention of Cameron, thereby offering the obvious advantage of using standard W3C XPath in exchanging/traversing data in relational databases (Krishnaprasad, abstract and paragraph [0023]).

**Claim 2** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows: "A method as recited in claim 31, further comprising reviewing configuration information to identify the defined attribute relationship associated with the view name in the location path expression" [Cameron, paragraphs [0035] and [0108]].

**Claim 3** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows: "A method as recited in claim 2, wherein reviewing configuration information further identifies a root level starting point associated with the view name" [Cameron, paragraphs [0045] and [0115]-[0116]].

**Claim 4** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows: "A method as recited in claim 2, wherein reviewing the configuration determines whether the client has permission to access the database based on the defined attribute relationship" [Cameron, paragraph [0044]].

**Claim 7** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows:

"A method as recited in claim 31, wherein client request is received according to the Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP)" [Cameron, paragraphs [0095] and [0098]].

**Claim 8** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows:

"A method as recited in claim 31, wherein one of the at least one path elements of the location path expression is a wildcard element" [Cameron, paragraph [0106]].

**Claim 9** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows:

"A method as recited in claim 31, wherein one of the at least one path elements of the location path expression indicates a search in a reversed direction of the predefined relationship" [Cameron, paragraph [0106] with Fig. 10].

**Claim 12** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows:

"A method as recited in claim 31, wherein the database is a directory service database" [Cameron, paragraphs [0005] and [0088]].

**Claim 14** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows:

"A method as recited in claim 38, further comprising obtaining configuration information from the server defining the relationships linking attributes of the objects in the database and associated view names thereof" [Cameron, paragraphs [0035], [0108], [0045], and [0122]].

**Claim 15** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows:

"A method as recited in claim 14, wherein sending the request sends the request in a message to the server according to the Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP)" [Cameron, paragraphs [0095] and [0098]].

**Claim 16** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows:

"A method as recited in claim 38, wherein one of the at least one path elements of the location path expression is a wildcard element" [Cameron, paragraph [0106]].

**Claims 18-20 and 21** encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claims 2-4 and 12, respectfully, in addition a to computer-readable medium and some instructions for a database server of a database for performing the computer-readable medium instructions of Claims 2-4 and 12, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 18-20, and 21 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 2-4 and 12, respectfully.

**Claim 29** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows:

"A method as recited in claim 38, wherein the server is a database server of the database" [Cameron, paragraphs [0005] and [0088]].

**Claim 30** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows:

"A method as recited in claim 38, wherein the database is a directory service database" [Cameron, paragraphs [0005] and [0088]].

**Claim 33** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows:

"A method as recited in claim 31, wherein the location path expression includes a plurality of objects related by the defined attribute relationship specified by the view name, and wherein each of the objects are separated by a forward slash" [Cameron, Figs. 10-12].

**Claim 34** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows:

"A method as recited in claim 31, where in at least one of the defined attribute

relationships includes a relationship between objects of different types that are linked by an attribute relationship” [Cameron, paragraph [0043] and Tables 1 and 4].

**Claim 36** can be mapped to Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) as follows:

“A method as recited in claim 31, wherein the method further includes:

- providing an application programming interface (API) from which applications on the client issue function calls to form the data path expression and to send the data path expression over a transport protocol to a Web service for directory access to the database”[Cameron, paragraphs [0005], [0045], [0098] [0088]].

**Claim 37** encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 31, in addition to a computer program product and some instructions for performing the method steps of Claim 31. Therefore, Claim 37 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 31. Additionally, Claim 37 recites “one or more physical computer-readable media having stored thereon computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause a computing system to perform the following” that can be mapped to Cameron as follows: [Cameron, paragraph [0041]].

**Claim 38** encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 31, in addition to a method and some steps for performing the method steps of Claim 31. Therefore, Claim 38 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 31. Additionally, Claim 38 recites “a method for receiving objects arranged in a hierarchy in a database requested from the database, the method comprising: connecting with a server providing access to objects stored in a database” that can be mapped to Cameron as follows: [Cameron, paragraphs [0034] and [0094]].

**Claim 39** encompasses substantially the same scope of the invention as that of Claim 31, in addition to a computer program product and some instructions for performing the method steps of Claim 31. Therefore, Claim 39 is rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claim 31. Additionally, Claim 39 recites "one or more physical computer-readable media having stored thereon computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a processor, cause a computing system to perform the following: connect with a server providing access to objects stored in a database" that can be mapped to Cameron as follows: [Cameron, paragraph [0041] with Cameron, paragraphs [0034] and [0094]].

14. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0004964 (Cameron et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078094 (Krishnaprasad et al.), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,954 (Traversat et al.).

For **Claim 32**, Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) teaches: "A method as recited in claim 31, wherein the database is a database of a Web service" [Cameron, paragraphs [0144]-[0145]].

Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach: "...and wherein the location path expression is translated into a plurality of LDAP queries that are processed by the Web service to satisfy the client request and that are iteratively processed until the client request is satisfied."

With respect to Claim 32, an analogous art, Traversat, teaches: "...and wherein the location path expression is translated into a plurality of LDAP queries that are processed by the Web service to satisfy the client request and that are iteratively processed until the client request is satisfied" [Traversat, col. 5, lines 38-42 with Cameron, paragraphs [0104] and [0109]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Traversat with Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) because both inventions are directed towards using directory services.

Traversat's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad)'s invention because both inventions use databases. Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) discloses dynamically generating multiple hierarchies of inter-object relationships based on object attribute values comprising a web accessible database of objects issuing queries, however Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) does not expressly disclose that LDAP is used as the protocol on how the queries in Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad) are formulated/formatted. Traversat discloses a method and data format for exchanging data between a java system database entry and an LDAP directory service comprising the use of the LDAP in directory services.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the use of the LDAP in directory services from Traversat and install it into the invention of Cameron (as modified by Krishnaprasad), thereby offering the

Art Unit: 2161

obvious advantage of tuning directories of Cameron to give quick-responses to high-volume lookup or search operations (Traversat, cols. 5-6, lines 60-13).



***Conclusion***

15. Any prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is advised that, although not used in the rejections above, prior art cited on any PTO-892 form and not relied upon is considered materially relevant to the applicant's claimed invention and/or portions of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent S. Stace whose telephone number is 571-272-8372 and fax number is 571-273-8372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-5:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu M. Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/B. S./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2161

/Apu M Mofiz/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161